

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 6, and 11-14 have been amended. The revisions to claims 1, 6, and 11-14 are supported, for example, at Figure 1 and at page 9, line 29 through page 10, line 3 in the specification. Claims 1-14 are pending, with claims 1, 6, and 11-14 being independent.

### Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 stand rejected being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,189,078 (Futral). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a data transfer apparatus. A controller fetches an address and data that are transferred between devices on the system bus so as to duplicate and store them in the associative memory. The devices are different from the data transfer apparatus itself.

Futral does not teach or suggest at least the above features of claim 1. Futral is directed to a method for accessing memory. However, Futral does not teach or suggest that a controller fetches addresses and data that are transferred between devices on the system bus, where those devices are different from the data transfer apparatus. Rather, Futral only discloses an associative member connected between a system bus and a local bus. *See, e.g.*, Figure 5. Futral does not teach or suggest that an address and data that is transferred between different devices on the system bus are fetched by a controller and stored in the associative memory. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 6 is directed to a data transfer apparatus. A controller fetches an address and data that are transferred between devices on the local bus so as to duplicate and store them in the associative memory, where the devices are different from the data transfer apparatus.

Futral also does not teach or suggest at least the above features of claim 6, which is similar to claim 1, but requires that addresses and data are transferred between different devices on the local bus.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claims 1 and 6, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination

with the features of its respective base claim, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 recites features similar to those of claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6.

Claims 12-14 are method claims that track claims 1, 6, and 11. Each of claims 12-14 recites a feature similar to those identified above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-14 are allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as noted above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 11.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

---

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM:DTL

Date: November 10, 2004